

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/812,104	03/30/2004	Kenichi Torii	1344.1141	1507	
21171	7590 11/16/2006	EXAMINER		INER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700			DIACOU	, ARI M	
	1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3663	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/812,104	TORII ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ari M. Diacou	3663
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e. cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 №</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 35 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35 is/are withdrawn 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Supplemental Action

1. This action is written in response to a call received from applicant's representative that the previous action addressed the wrong response in the file history. Applicant's representative was correct; the wrong action was copied when creating the last action. The erroneous action was mailed on 11-1-2006, applicant's representative notified the examiner on 11-8-2006. As of 11-1-2006, applicant had a response date of 12-1-2006. Based on the time the applicant realized the error, it is decided according to 710.06 of the MPEP that the applicant's new date of response be set to 1 month from the mailing of this action.

Election/Restrictions

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1, 2, and 4, drawn to a Raman amplifier and species previously elected, classified in class 359, subclass 334.
 - II. Claim 35, drawn to a method of pumping an optical amplifier, classified in class 359, subclass 341.3.
- 3. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus

Art Unit: 3663

as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method may be used to operate an optical amplifier employing Optical Time Domain Reflectometry apparatus.

- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. Claims 35 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 11-25-2005.

Art Unit: 3663

Response to Arguments

- 8. In the remarks filed 4-12-2006, applicant argued the following:
 - A. On pages 12-14, that Akasaka is not available under 35 USC 102(b) because Akasaka's two pump sets have the same frequency range, an the claimed invention only reads on pumps with different wavelength ranges spaced by roughly integer number of Stokes shifts (excluding zero).
 - B. On page 2, that the applicant has submitted new drawings with the objections addressed.
- 9. Argument A. is convincing the rejection is hereby withdrawn. However, new art has been applied, see below.
- 10. Argument B. is convincing the objection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/812,104 Page 5

Art Unit: 3663

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 13. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) as being anticipated/rendered obvious by Islam et al. (USP No. 2003/0016437).
 - Regarding claim 1, Islam discloses a Raman amplifier for supplying pumping
 lights to an amplification medium through which is propagated a wavelength
 division multiplexed signal light obtained by multiplexing a plurality of signal lights
 of different wavelengths, to amplify the wavelength division multiplexed signal
 light due to a Raman effect [Abstract], comprising:
 - o a first pumping light generating section that generates a plurality of pumping lights arranged at equal wavelength spacing in a signal light wavelength band where said plurality of signal lights are arranged, which is shifted to a shorter wavelength side in accordance with the wavelength width corresponding to a Raman shift frequency; [Fig. 4, "nth order Raman"]
 - o a second pumping light generating section that generates pumping lights of one or more wavelengths arranged in a wavelength band on at least one of a shorter wavelength side and a longer wavelength side than a wavelength band of the pumping lights generated by said first pumping light generating section, the wavelength and power of which are set so that peak wavelength spacing of a Raman gain in the signal light

Art Unit: 3663

wavelength band is substantially equal to each other; and [Fig. 4, "n-1 order Raman"]

- o a multiplexing section that multiplexes the pumping lights generated respectively by said first and second pumping light generating sections to supply the multiplexed pumping light to said amplification medium.
 - [The multiplexers shown in figure 4 of Islam can read on "a multiplexing section" 102(b)]
 - [Alternatively, Islam discloses in figures 36 and 37 (and described in paragraphs 0187-0189, that the co/counter pumping mechanism (same as figure 4 of Islam), as well as the twice multiplexed pumping mechanism (shown in Fig. 1 of the instant application) are known in the art, rendering it obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the pumping mechanism of Fig. 37 in the device of Fig. 1 for the advantage of optimizing gain for the advantages of counterpropagating pump light as known in the art. 103(a)]
- Regarding claim 2, Islam discloses where and why to place gain equalizers in paragraph 0172.
- Regarding claim 4, Islam discloses a Raman amplifier according to claim 1, wherein the wavelength allocation is adopted, in which the signal light wavelength band is narrower than a wavelength band corresponding to the Raman shift frequency, and a signal light wavelength band and a pumping light

Art Unit: 3663

wavelength band are separated from each other. [Figures 36-37] [Furthermore, the limitations of this claim are statements of intended use. The Stokes shift of 13.2 THz (100 nm @ 1550 nm) places a theoretical limit on the bandwidth of a Raman amplifier, it is a statement of intended use to limit the bandwidth of signals that *do* pass through, as opposed to the bandwidth that *could* pass through]

14. The italicized clauses are essentially method limitations or statements or intended or desired use. Thus, these claims as well as other statements of intended use do not serve to patentably distinguish the claimed structure over that of the reference. See In re Pearson, 181 USPQ 641; In re Yanush, 177 USPQ 705; In re Finsterwalder, 168 USPQ 530; In re Casey, 512 USPQ 235; In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458; Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647.

See MPEP § 2114 which states:

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. <u>Ex parte Masham</u>, 2 USPQ 2nd 1647

Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than functions. In re Danly, 120 USPQ 528, 531.

Apparatus claims cover what a device is not what a device does. <u>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.</u>, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528.

As set forth in MPEP § 2115, a recitation in a claim to the material or article worked upon does not serve to limit an apparatus claim. In this case, light in any of its forms, frequencies, modulations, phases, polarizations or intensities is the article worked upon.

Art Unit: 3663

Conclusion

- 15. While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See In re Mraz, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).
- 16. The references made herein are done so for the convenience of the applicant.

 They are in no way intended to be limiting. The prior art should be considered in its entirety.
- 17. The prior art which is cited but not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ari M. Diacou whose telephone number is (571) 272-5591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on (571) 272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMD 11/9/2006

Leunden M. Hypes Primary ExaminER 143663